

Eastern Illinois University The Keep

Minutes

Faculty Senate

2-5-2019

February 5, 2019

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "February 5, 2019" (2019). *Minutes*. 1116.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1116

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting on Feb 05, 2019

Room 4440, Booth Library

Note: This minutes is a summary of the proceeding, not a verbatim transcript.

Attendance: Abebe, Bruns, Chahyadi, Corrigan, Holly, Hugo, Hung, Oliver, Shaw, Stowell, Wharram, VanGunten
Student Senate Representative: Gordon
Guests: Provost Gatrell, Dr. Jeanne Lord, Dr. Jake Emmett, Dr. Krakenbracker, Dr. Anita Shelton (CLAS), Ms. Haynes (DEN)

Bruns called meeting to order at 2:04 pm.

Stowell moved to accept minutes from last meeting. Seconded Wharram. All pass.

Dr. Lord from CHHS reporting on the establishing the new college. Dr. Emmett is the Associate Dean. Created new introduction sheet. There's a second sheet for students. Human Services and Community Leadership, Nutrition and Dietetics from FCS now in CHHS. Fashion Merchandizing to CLAS. Hospitality and Tourism in Lumpkin. Talked to stakeholders around campus about the new college. Formed joint alumni board with CoE. First goal is to create visibility first on campus, and then off campus. Started collaborating with SBHC with Dr. Ranchero. Spoke to providers there about the new college. The message is that the new role of CHHS is to be resource for SBHC, with qualified graduates and students and faculty. Met with Coles County Public Health as well. This will hopefully create opportunities for internships, jobs, experience opportunities. Identified undergrad research as a main objective, because it leads to retention. Created a research scholarship SURF, 4 of those. A research for faculty interdisciplinary award. This means establishing various committees that are required for a college to work. Needed to draft up a new policy set for the college. There's a GA working on social media page. Third focus is student mentoring. Identified study abroad internships as a focus for the college. Also targeted Honors program. Health promotion started their honors program. Focus on recruitment, especially for new units. Needed new recruiting material and new marketing programs. Established new mission statement. Outreach programs are critical to the college's mission. Child and Family Life Center offering more opportunities. Adult fitness center. Childcare center. Autism program. STEP program for students with autism spectrum. Master in Aging Studies under Human Services and Community Leadership. Three different accelerated Masters program.

Stowell: For the online courses, are there other dept doing online?

Lord: Health Promotion thinking to take the Emergency Management program online.

Oliver: Thank you for the work you've done.

Bruns: What are some of the surprises in setting up the new college?

Lord: More along the areas of budgets and accounts, the behind the scene things that need to be in place to get a college functioning.

Abebe: The university is an asset to the community. The relationship with SBHC is an important piece and I am glad you're working on that. The reaching out to these regional stakeholders is important for our school.

Gatrell: I want to thank Dr. Lord for the hard work and commitment to Eastern. The work of setting up a new college is hard work and I appreciate what you've done.

Report on Executive Board meeting with Dr. Glassman:

Stowell: Updates that technology plan has been approved by BoT. The cost shift from dept to ITS so now purchasing for technology is done at ITS not out of dept budgets. The President Lecture series will be Feb 18, Dr. Gaines Foster from LSU. Glassman wishes to formalize the 360 review document, which we did. Also need to move forward with the Think Tank project.

Bruns: I attended BoT to update on FacSen and share concerns from faculty via dept meetings, particularly focusing on the shift from cut-and-save to investment. Our school is moving towards positive direction but we need to have honest conversations about what our school's needs are.

Wharram: What's the scale for the topic and theme for the next year's lecture?

Bruns: Presented both to the President and he seems interested in both.

Committee Reports:

Stowell: For Election committee – we have the candidates. Plan to release announcement of election mid Feb. Election will take place prior to Spring Break. That will include the Constitutional changes.

Oliver: From nomination, Chahyadi and I will analyze the vacancies. That typically follows the election. Few weeks ago, the assessment suggested that most of the committees are functioning as needed. To follow up on suggestion of adding library faculty to UTEC.

Bruns: Awalt reached out to our Dean I nominated Stacey Knight-Davis and I am not aware of others.

Oliver: Reached out to Brad Bennington on what will become of the Student Process committee.

Gordon: Slimming down activities in Feb to ensure that campus can participate in the AAH month. Planning on spring election.

Gatrell: Provost report. Some updates to vitalization process. All the programs listed as 1.2 or 1.3 are now stable. The programs have significant improvements. While some programs still struggle to meet IBHE enrollment standards, there are across-the-board effort to make improvements. Very pleased with the efforts and outcomes. Special Ed program went online and went 400% in enrollment. English program has increased first-time student enrollment. Want to acknowledge all the programs effort to make things better. About 14 to 15 searches authorized for late Dec to Jan. The majority of Unit B searches are place holders for Unit A. A list of the final requests will come in July. Some single year ACF some mutli year ACF now going on. Meeting with CAA to get advice on the model for GenEd coordinator. Hope to meet with CAA next week to work out some of the details about GenEd. We want to honor our commitment to HLC on making GenEd a core part of our university and to have significant faculty leadership in GenEd so that there's a process in place to appropriately monitor, assess, and manage our GenEd curricula. Changes to Redden Grant are being made. It has been cumbersome to spend the money that were awarded. Working with Deans since last year to streamline application process and spending money once awarded. Identify allocation methods consistent with participation rate, FTE, and spend rate. The model will be modified and reviewed every few years. The new model will emerge in Spring. The funding mechanism is that the Redden Fund is to improve on undergrad education. There really are no other restrictions on this. The new model will assign block grants to each college and then each college will determine how to evaluate applications and then to decided how to distribute the funding within that college. Dean searches are on the way. We announced Dr. Eirson will be CHHS.

Hung: Concerning the Redden Grant rework, does this mean that the Deans will now be in charge of deciding who gets awards?

Gatrell: The strength of the Redden is faculty center and faculty driven, but each college will figure out how to implement that.

Olvier: You mentioned that the Redden Grant has been about \$130k/yr. Has that been consistent or has that grown?

Gatrell: That depends on the crops performance. Betwen 128 and 135 each year.

Shaw: What is the formula used in deciding how much each college will get?

Gatrell: We determined the rate based on historic data, FTE, participation rate, win rate.

Larry White: Faculty Advisory council to IBHE. The IBHE only has 1 vacant faculty slot appointed by Governor. One of the issues that the faculty advisory council talks about is increasing

faculty input into IBHE, to match the student representation which is student selected. There are 36 members on the faculty advisory council to IBHE. 12 from public universities, 12 from community colleges, 12 from private and for-profit schools. Three caucuses as well as joint meetings. Last year in April we hosted the FacAdv here at EIU, other campuses took interest in that. This year, at the start, we settled into 5 working groups, hoping to deliver outcomes to communicate with legislators, IBHE, and other constituents. I am on program prioritization and consolidation. At various levels, some state wide, like the Chapin-Brady bill, there have been talk of consolidating across campuses. That proposal has died. Though Brady did say that the bill might have died but the idea may still come back. We are looking at models from other states. Also discussion about issues on specific campuses, e.g., will the consolidation effort be faculty led or administration led, or driven by IBHE enrollment data? What is the right level of faculty engagement? One of the other groups is P20 outreach to show engagement of universities with pre-elementary through college, and to community. Another group looks at the Illinois Articulation Initiative, regarding acceptance of IAI credits at different schools. The nature of transferrable courses. That ties into the 4th group, which looks at dual credit issues and regional dual credit systems. This comes up as more pressure to give students credits during HS courses. There is a lot of legislative push for that direction. Historically, the CC has been the main agent to offer those dual credits. There are now some conflicting issues regarding the credentializing of the CC instructors. The legislative pressure may run afoul the IBHE standards. Another issue is when HS has established relations with 4-year college out of state instead of with local CC. There is encouragement to have 4 years from within state to engage in the dual credit, like what EIU has. 5th group is This We Believe, focus on a one-page summary of the benefits of higher education to students, communities, and state. Hope to finalize around March/April, so it can be discussed with the legislature.

Hung: Any news on how other regionals are doing in terms of recovering enrollment?

White: Large concern is about new resources needed for investment. Still no capital budget and that has been an outstanding issue for a while.

Oliver: Dual credits – our department is establishing a second dual credit program. Will our work be in conflict with what IBHE is working on?

Gatrell: In the downstate model – our faculty teach those courses. More similar to dual enrollment than dual credit. If a rural school doesn't have the right credentialed person in place to teach. The traditional model – a coordinator model where we use K12 instructor that has Master + 18, and then they are the instructor on record. In our model, we have a coordinator to meet with the students and the instructors.

Abebe: Who decided the topic for the 5 groups? Faculty or IBHE?

White: The president, with help from the executive committee, then the specifics are honed by each of the groups.

Abebe: Perhaps there might be other issues beyond what's covered in these 5? Second question, what is your sense: is the baccalaureate degree the only legitimate path towards success and fulfillment?

White: I think the answer is clear that it is not the only way. But then, what do we do? We are facing pressure to abandon the baccalaureate model. For instance, teacher preparation. Few years ago, the teach ed requirements have increased, which led to decrease in pipeline and lacking students. Now the legislature is thinking of alternate paths which then circumvent the new safeguards. The FacAd council is pushing back hard on that. In other discussions, such as do people in IT need gen ed foundational courses? Many people can do well with self learning without the liberal arts education. So while it's not the only path, it is one path that is worth preserving and fighting for. For perspective, the people who are pushing the for-profit vocational models are sending their own kids to the elite colleges for the 4-year experience.

Abebe: declining completion rate might also be an important issue to look at.

Bruns: On Feb 19, we will have Interim Dean Shelton from CLAS here to talk to us about the merging of CLAS. Then on Mar 5, Dr. Dobbs will talk about EIU in its environment. That'll be a step in setting up the Think Tank. April 16, Interim VP Drake will come talk about VP Student Affairs. We will invite VP McCann in Fall. Possibly invite Athletic Director Michael as well.

Bruns: I do not wish to overstep the bounds of work currently going on in drafting these proposals for establishing a dedicated ACF seat.

VanGunten: I think the 1 year term seems too quick. Why did we choose 1 year?

Stowell: Stipulation is 4th semester for Unit A. Also there is the point of missing an incentive for ACF to be on FacSen. For Unit A, there is an incentive in terms of documented work/service. Though this will open the door wider to encourage participation, there's no actual incentive for ACF. So if there's an incentive, then maybe we don't need a dedicated seat.

Bruns: From my conversations, the ACF is seeing that a dedicated seat represents a reserved voice and channel. They are interested in that.

Stowell: But there's no historical record for that level of interest.

Oliver: I will be happy to support this resolution if you think this will generate new interests.

Abebe: I've heard ACF that they'll be happy to serve, so the service itself is an incentive. I am reluctant to support additional CU. If there are other incentives other than CU. We do not wish to erode certain norms of practice.

Hung: I think there are two ways to look at this. For Unit A faculty, service is part of our contract so we do not need additional CUs assigned. For ACF, since service is not part of their contract, giving them CU for the work seems reasonable. But on the other hand, making service on FacSen something worth CU has all sorts of implications for workload assignment as well, and may in fact limit the number of people who can participate.

VanGuntten: The incentive piece may be a step ahead. If we have troubles filling that seat, then we can revisit that point.

Bruns: Is there value to having the seat to be 1 year seat to get more participation from ACF?

Wharram: The value is for people who already know won't be here for more than year.

Oliver: To bring attention to this maybe hold a separate special election in Aug for this position?

Bruns: Some reservation that if the election is done differently than the other seats.

Wharram: I am in favor with either 1 or 3 year term. One question is who can vote for ACF? Will only ACF get to vote for ACF representative?

Holly: I support the 3 year model. That will reduce the number of election logistics. I think the dedicated seat is a good idea. I am not sure about the CU issue. I know it takes effort to find the time to come to the meeting and ACFs are often teaching 4/4 loads.

Wharram: The giving of CU can backfire because it means maybe overload.

Chahyadhii: Maybe we need to talk to ACFs and hear what they want.

Shaw: I was ACF here for a few years. I feel the visibility and the dedication of a seat will have been an incentive enough for me to want to participate.

Stowell: In this year's call for election, I have inserted the call for Unit B. If we go the dedicated seat, we can't go back, because that'd be a slap in the face. Maybe we can run it this way, and if we don't have a participant, then we can consider a dedicated seat.

Shaw: How long have we made the explicit to welcome ACF?

Stowell: The formal one is this Fall in special election.

Oliver: We have enough difficulty to get Unit A to run, and there's already incentive. But in the past we haven't seen ACF participation. I am willing to support this to try it out. But I worry that in the future years we keep being unable to fill those seats. I would like to support Stowell's approach.

Wharram: I respectfully disagree with the proposal to wait. I think the points are valid, but if we are to take actions we should do this while the topic is prominent. If we don't get participation then we will be back to square one. I think we do need to decide who is voting for that seat.

Hung: On the point of having to eliminate the ACF seat because it is not filled. We wouldn't be eliminating the seat if CLAS seat is not filled. We would go back and find more candidates. We should treat the ACF seat the same way. Even if it does not fill in an election cycle, we will simply try again until it does fill. I agree that once we establish an ACF seat then we wouldn't go back, but not for that reason. We would not go back because we recognize the value of having an ACF voice in our council, and that importance doesn't go away just because we do not fill the seat.

Holly: I agree with what Hung is saying. I don't think it will be difficult to eliminate if we need to. I also agree with VanGunten that the CU discussion is premature. So perhaps the focus group is not necessary.

Stowell: I agree that the focus group is not necessary. Based on the current discussion, we'd want to change 1-year to 3-year term. We also don't need that line about specific cycles.

Bruns: So we are modifying the term length for the ACF seat. But we're keeping the replacement procedure in case the seat is not filled.

Hung: Shouldn't the other college-specific seats also follow this procedure?

Bruns: I believe that is already the case.

Wharram: So what to do with eligibility to vote for this seat?

Stowell: I am okay with allowing everyone to vote on every seat. But I know there will be faculty out there who would want to have a say in their own college. So I think we should restrict the voting for the seat to the members of the constituent.

Wharram: Will it be a problem to implement during election? Do we need to explicitly state that?

Stowell: It's another button on a list of criteria in formulating the election. As for the language, we can copy the language from other areas that already say that.

Bruns: So a dedicated ACF seat for 3 year term voted on by ACF. If nobody runs for that seat, we will look for an at-large Senator to fill that spot, and then we will do the search again in the next election cycle.

Chahyadi: What is the percent participation in the voting for ACF?

VanGunten: I think the rate is low.

Chahyadi: So should we let Unit A faculty also vote on the ACF seat candidate?

Bruns: I think restricting the voting eligibility to only ACF reinforces that this seat is a voice for the ACF on our campus. Allowing Unit A to vote on that seat will dilute that impact.

Roll call vote to approve establishing a Senate Seat dedicated to ACF, of 3 year term, and whose election is limited to ACF. Wharram yes. VanGunten yes. Chahyadi yes. Abebe yes. Hugo yes. Shaw yes. Oliver no. Holly yes. Corrigan yes. Stowell No. Bruns Yes. Hung yes. Resolution passed.

Holly motioned to adjourn at 3:57 pm. Oliver seconded. All passed.